Every practical class should include the work with a patient. A constant training is necessary for proper examination of the patient by the student and prevention of possible difficulties. The student must not be afraid of the patient! Under such conditions the student gradually learns how to make a correct diagnosis allowing him to choose optimal therapeutic tactics and rely upon a successful solution of the problem.

Thus, when learning surgery is completed the student should be able to:

- demonstrate mastering moral-deontological, legal principles of a medical specialist and principles of professional subordination;
- give urgent medical aid in case of the most spread surgical diseases;
- make differentiation diagnostics, substantiation and making primary diagnosis in case of the most common surgical diseases;
- define the tactics of management (principles of surgery and conservative therapy, rehabilitation etc.);
- demonstrate abilities to fill in medical documents in the surgical hospital.

Considering all the mentioned above and corresponding to the contemporary requirements of modern life, the main task of a clinical department, is to form a clinical thinking, sufficient volume of theoretical knowledge and practical skills of the student, which are necessary for a contemporary physician.

NEW APPROACHES TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONSTRUCTIVE INTERACTION OF THE TEACHER AND THE STUDENT

Skrypnykov P.N., Pisarenko O.A.

Ukrainian medical stomatological academy, Poltava, Ukraine

Individual personality plays a sizeable role in determining a teacher's particular style of interaction in the classroom. Nonetheless, an awareness of important aspects of interaction can guide one in becoming the kind of teacher who influences the lives of students beyond simply matters of subject matter.

The aim of this study is to find the basic styles of teacher-student interaction.

One's style is the product of how responsive to individual needs one is along with how much authority he or she demands. Based on this idea, Diana Baumrind [2] describes models of control that administrations of academy have in relationship to students. While these models emerged from her work on parenting styles, she notes that they have greatly influ-

enced educators as well. The models have in fact been meaningfully applied to the educational setting [1].

There are differential benefits to students and teachers present in each of these two styles. Students may have a strong affinity for aspects of the permissive classroom. Adolescents in particular crave to opportunity to exercise freedoms and to self-express. As a result, permissive teachers may be well-liked by their students. "Well-liked," how-ever, is not the same thing as "respected." Students actually expect a certain degree of order in the classroom and are dissatisfied with an environment that is excessively disruptive to instruction [9]. The teacher must remember that his or her duty is that of a professional educator and not that of a best friend to students. Without some establishment and enforcement of expectations for students, it is difficult to imagine how meaningful learning could take place.

The way that teachers and students interact is a critical factor in determining student outcomes. In a "meta-review" of 30 variables identified as being influential to student learning in the literature, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg [8] found student-teacher social interaction to be among the top three most important factors. Students identify relationships with teachers as being among the most important parts of their academy experience. How a teacher interacts with students translates into products important to education.

Motivating students to participate in lessons and to engage in the curriculum can be very challenging. Students are so stimulated by entities outside of academy such as television, video games, and peer groups that it is difficult to spark their interest with matters of academying. At the same time, however, teachers must be aware of the fact that the way that they interact with their students may exacerbate this motivation challenge.

Alfie Kohn [5] describes the connection between a teacher's style and student motivation in terms of the "doing to" versus the "working with" classroom. In the "doing to" classroom, the teacher directs all activity and focuses on compliance with that direction. In the "working with" classroom, the students' questions and interests drive the activity and the teacher facilitates learning in a collaborative fashion. The "working with" environment "supports students's desire to find out about things, facilitates the process of discovery, and, in general, meets students's needs". In short, providing for student autonomy in the classroom enhances an enduring motivation to take an active part in learning.

The first way in which teachers influence the social development of their students, as was just discussed with motivation, is by acting toward them in a non-controlling manner. DeVries and Zan [3] explain how controlling atmospheres lead to feelings of helplessness among students, while accepting, respectful, and stimulating atmospheres lead to feelings of effectiveness. The views that students are to respect administrations by virtue of their position and that administrations are supposed to wield their power

results in disrespectful attitudes toward students in academys. The outcome is the powerful “hidden lesson” in the curriculum that one is to be unquestionably submissive to those with power. This lesson retards socio-moral growth due to its teaching that interpersonal understanding is insignificant because it is some external structure, not the way that people act toward one another, that determines relationships.

It is important to recognize, however, that authoritarianism is not the only avenue for managing classroom behavior. Jones and Jones [4] identify positive teacher-student relationships and “classrooms as communities of support” as being critical components to classroom management. When student emotional and psychological needs are met, students are less likely to be problems in the classroom.

Standardized testing and accountability measures have generated many concerns among teachers. Such measures, which not only determine student placement but are also used to evaluate academy effectiveness, affect curriculum and pedagogy. One of the ways that the effects of such measures are borne out in the classroom is in the way that teachers and students interact. High-stakes testing “compels teachers to spend valuable time preparing students to take tests and teaching to the test, undermining what otherwise could be sound, responsive teaching and learning” and “discourages social and intellectual development, such as cooperation, creativity and problem-solving skills, as time is spent on learning exactly what appears on the test”. When so much importance is placed on how students score on a single test, quality classroom participation, student intellectual interests, and deep discussion become subordinate to teaching to that test. As Sacks [6] writes: When academys teach to a test, the test becomes the nearly exclusive focus of teachers and students attention. “Science,” and its teaching and learning, for example, therefore becomes a series of test items, usually in the format of multiple-choice questions. The very nature of learning, as an open-ended, somewhat uncertain, spontaneous, creative, and complex process, is turned upside down.

It may be the case that teachers must compromise content coverage in terms of breadth and depth in the name of test preparation. Within these curricular constraints, however, teachers can still deliver instruction with attention to quality interaction. For example, Taylor and Walton [7] found that improved test scores can accompany student-centered instruction when students are provided with a series of test-preparation workshops. Here, a relatively small amount of time practicing the mechanics of taking multiple-choice tests replaced teacher reliance on drill and lecture and preserved the opportunity for quality teacher-student interaction in the classroom. This is an approach that may work well for some academys, while others may need to search for additional creative solutions. Creative solutions are found when teachers identify the specific needs of their students in terms of

preparing for the test (i.e., topic breadth/depth, practice with test format, specific mode and sequence of instruction) and balance those needs with the students' needs for personal interaction. Thus, no "cookie cutter" approach is available that will work for all students in all academys, but balancing effective test preparation with quality interaction is important task and a necessary endeavor if students' complete educational needs are to be met in this time of high-stakes testing.

Another negative impact of high-stakes testing may be even more difficult to remedy. The implementation of these tests has also undermined the morale of both students and teachers. Amid the stress imposed by being expected to meet testing standards, students may respond by disengaging from the process altogether. Such students might hold oppositional attitudes toward academy and their teachers. Within the test-driven accountability system, teachers may feel a loss of autonomy and professional respect, with so many of their decisions regarding curriculum and instruction being dictated to them. Given an environment of obstinate students and unhappy teachers, it is easy to envision how teacher-student interaction could be drastically compromised. This ugly byproduct of high-stakes testing appears to always be a possibility so long as academy communities do not fully "buy in" to this accountability system.

Literature:

1. Baumrind D. Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. / Baumrind D./ Child Development.-1996.-# 37(4).-P. 887–907.

2. Baumrind D.Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology.-1977.-# 4(1).-P. 99–102.

3. DeVries R. Moral classrooms, moral children: Creating a constructivist atmosphere in early education. / DeVries R., Zan B. S./ New York: Teachers College Press.-1994.-P.554

4. Jones V. F. Comprehensive classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems (5th ed.)./ Jones V. F., Jones L. S./ Boston: Allyn and Bacon.-1998

5. Kohn A. What to look for in a classroom. Educational Leadership /Kohn A./ New York: Harper and Row.-1996.- #54(1).-P. 54–55.

6. Sacks P. Standardized minds: The high price of America's testing culture and what we can do to change it./ Sacks P. New York: Da Capo Press. – 1999.-P.45

7. Taylor K. Co-opting standardized tests in the service of learning. / Taylor K., Walton S./ Phi Delta Kappan.-1997.-# 79(1).-P. 66–70.

8. Wang M. C., Haertel G. D., Walberg H. J. What influences learning? A content analysis review of literature./ Wang M. C., Haertel G. D., Walberg H. J./ Journal of Educational Research.-1990.-# 84(1).-P. 30–43.

9. Winik L. W. Students want more discipline, disruptive classmates out. / Winik L. W. / American Educator.-1996.-# 20(3).-P. 12–14.